arXiv:1702.03173v1 [math.PR] 10 Feb 2017

Fragmentation process, pruning poset for rooted forests, and Möbius inversion

Ellen Baake * – Mareike Esser †

Faculty of Technology, Bielefeld University, Box 100131, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany

Abstract We consider a fragmentation process that describes a specific way of successively removing objects from a linear arrangement. The process is a Markov chain, which is formulated in both a continuous-time and a discrete-time version. We aim at the law of the process over time. To this end, we investigate sets of realisations of this process that agree with respect to a specific order of events and represent each such set by a rooted (binary) tree. The probability distribution of the fragmentation process is then given as the sum over all relevant tree probabilities. The probability of each tree is, in turn, obtained by Möbius inversion on a suitable poset of all rooted forests that can be obtained from the tree by edge deletion; we call this poset the *pruning poset*. In continuous time, explicit expressions for the probabilities of the trees transpire without much effort. In discrete time, however, dependencies within the fragments, which get lost over time, make it difficult to obtain analogous explicit results. We therefore construct an auxiliary process for every given tree, which is i.i.d. over time, and which allows to give a pathwise construction of realisations that match the tree. The fragmentation process arises in population genetics and describes the ancestry of the genetic material of individuals in a population experiencing recombination.

Keywords: Möbius inversion, fragmentation process, poset of rooted forests

MSC 2010 Subject classification: 05A15 (primary), 60J20 (secondary), 05C05, 06B99

1 Introduction

Consider a linear arrangement of n discrete objects captured in the set $L = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We like to think of L as a chain, and the elements of L as *links* of the chain, in the sense of the connecting components of a real-world chain. If links are removed, the remaining set of links splits into contiguous fragments. We will investigate the probability distribution of a Markov chain $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ on the set of subsets of L, where F_t is the set of links removed until time t. The details of the process will be described below; let us only note here that $F_0 = \varnothing$ and that, at every point in time, *at most* one link is removed from *every* fragment with a given probability or rate. Time is either discrete ($t \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$) or continuous ($t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$). We speak of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ as the *fragmentation process*.

*E-mail: ebaake@techfak.uni-bielefeld.de

†E-mail: messer@techfak.uni-bielefeld.de

In [3], we have worked out the distribution of F_t for all t. This is immediate and explicit for the continuous-time version of the process, since simultaneous events are automatically excluded and links are, in fact, independent at all times (with probability one). In discrete time, however, the links are dependent: removing a given link forbids to remove any other link in the same fragment in the same time step. Links are thus dependent as long as they belong to the same fragment, and become independent once they have been separated. For each realisation of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$, the order of events therefore matters. One may thus collect all realisations of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ that agree on the order of events and that end up in a particular state G at time t and represent this set of realisations as a rooted binary tree. Here, the elements of F_t are identified with the vertices of that tree in such a way that the relevant time order of events of the fragmentation process is encoded by the partial order on the vertices of the tree. In [3], the probability that $F_t = G$, $G \subseteq L$, for some $t \geqslant 0$, is given as a sum over all probabilities related to trees with vertex set G. The probability for each individual tree was obtained from a technical calculation by summing over all possible combinations of branch lengths, i.e. over all possible combinations of times that F_t spends in the various states. This summation led to an alternating sum over terms that reflect a decomposition of the tree into subtrees. The result provided an answer to the problem, but was somewhat unsatisfactory since both the combinatorial and the probabilistic meanings remained in the dark. As to the combinatorial side, the alternating sum hinted at an underlying, yet unidentified, inclusion-exclusion principle; an instance of the "wide gap between the bare statement of the principle and the skill required in recognizing that it applies to a particular combinatorial problem", as stated by Rota in his seminal work on Möbius functions [15]. As to the probabilistic side, the terms in the sum hinted at some underlying independence across subtrees, but were hard to interpret in detail.

The purpose of this article is to provide both the combinatorial and the probabilistic insight into the solution of the fragmentation process, and thus to give a conceptual proof for it. At the same time, the building blocks are of independent interest. On the combinatorial side, we will introduce a suitable poset (to be called the *pruning poset*) on general rooted forests that can be obtained from a rooted tree via specific edge deletion. We will investigate the pruning poset in detail, provide its Möbius function and the corresponding Möbius inversion. This will lead to the inclusion-exclusion principle underlying our tree probabilities. In continuous time, this structure will indeed translate into the probabilities of interest without much effort, due to the independence of the links.
On the probabilistic side, we construct, on the same probability space, an *auxiliary process* with *time-independent law*, from which one can read off the law of the discrete-time version of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ via a pathwise construction. This allows one to cope with the dependence of the links and the resulting state dependence of the transitions of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in discrete time.

The article is organised as follows. We will start (Section 2) with a general investigation of trees and rooted forests, which is independent from the application to the fragmentation process. We then construct the pruning poset, find its Möbius function, and give the corresponding Möbius inversion principle. In Section 3, we define the fragmentation process $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in its continuous-time and discrete-time versions, relate sets of realisations of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ to the rooted trees from Section 2, and use Möbius inversion on the pruning poset to obtain an expression for the tree probabilities (Section 3.2). The result holds for continuous and discrete time alike. We next apply it, first to the continuous-time case and then

to discrete time, to obtain explicit expressions for the tree probabilities; in discrete time this relies on the auxiliary process, which is introduced in Section 3.3. We recapitulate the method in some afterthoughts in Section 3.5. We close by briefly explaining the application of the fragmentation process in population genetics, where it describes how the genetic material of an individual is distributed across different ancestors in populations that experience recombination (Section 4).

2 Möbius inversion on a poset of rooted forests

Let $T = (\gamma, V, E)$ denote a rooted tree with root γ, vertex (or node) set $V = V(T)$ and set of edges $E = E(T) \subseteq V \times V$. The set of vertices together with the standard partial order on rooted trees defines a partially ordered set (*poset*) $(V, \preccurlyeq)$. Namely, for any two nodes $\alpha, \beta \in V$, $\alpha \preccurlyeq \beta$ means that α is on the path from γ to β. As usual, we write $x \prec y$ if $x \preccurlyeq y$ and $x \neq y$. We write $x \succcurlyeq y$ if $y \preccurlyeq x$. Obviously, γ is the minimal element of V with respect to $\preccurlyeq$. If α and β are adjacent and $\alpha \prec \beta$, we write $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ and call α and β the *ends* of e; more precisely, α is the *lower end* and β the *upper end* of e. The partial order on V obviously induces a partial order on E (via the partial order of the upper ends, say), which we will (by slight abuse of notation) also denote by $\preccurlyeq$.

For a fixed tree $T = (\gamma, V, E)$ and a given subset H of E, we denote by $T - H$ the *rooted forest* obtained from T by deleting all edges $e \in H$; we speak of these edges as *cut edges* (see Figure 1a). The remaining *connected components* (or *components*) of T are disjoint rooted trees, where the root in each component is the unique vertex that is minimal with respect to $\preccurlyeq$. For all $\alpha \in V$, we now denote by $T_\alpha(H)$ the subtree in $T - H$ that consists of α and all its descendants, see Figure 1c. By slight abuse of notation, we abbreviate the corresponding vertex and edge sets by $V_\alpha(H) := V(T_\alpha(H))$ and $E_\alpha(H) := E(T_\alpha(H))$, respectively. Our rooted forest $T - H$ then is the disjoint collection of all $T_\alpha(H)$ with $\alpha = \gamma$ or α an upper end of some $e \in H$ (c.f. Figure 1b).

For a given forest $T - H$, a special role is played by the subtree $T_\gamma(H)$, whose root coincides with the root of T. We call this tree the *stump tree* of the rooted forest and say its vertex set $V_\gamma(H)$ is the *stump set*. Explicitly, for $H = \{e_1, \ldots, e_k\}$ with $e_i = (\alpha_i, \beta_i)$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$,

$$V_\gamma(H) = V \setminus \{\nu \in V : \nu \succ \alpha_i \text{ for some } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant k\}. \tag{1}$$

We denote the set of all possible stump sets by

$$\mathcal{R}(T) := \{V_\gamma(H) : H \subseteq E\}. \tag{2}$$

Remark 1. Every $R \in \mathcal{R}(T)$ is an (order) ideal of the poset $(V, \preccurlyeq)$ of vertices of T, that is, every $R \in \mathcal{R}(T)$ is a subset of V with the property that $\alpha \in R$ and $\beta \preccurlyeq \alpha$ together imply $\beta \in R$, see for instance [16, p. 100]. ♢

Any stump set may be defined via a special set of cut edges. For a given $R \in \mathcal{R}(T)$, we denote by $\partial(R)$ the set of edges that separates R from the remaining set of vertices $V \setminus R$ and call it the *stump cut set* of R, compare Figure 1d. Explicitly,

$$\partial(R) := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in E : \alpha \in R,\, \beta \in V \setminus R\};$$


α_8 α_4 α_5 α_6 α_7 α_2 α_3 α_1
α_7 α_8 α_5 α_6 α_3 α_4 α_2 α_1
$T_{\alpha_4}(H)$ $T_{\alpha_2}(H)$ $T_{\alpha_1}(H)$
α_7 α_3 α_5 α_6 α_7 α_8 α_1 α_2 α_3 α_4 α_5 α_6 α_7 α_8
α_8 α_4 α_5 α_6 α_7 α_2 α_3 α_1

(a) Tree and cut edges

(b) Rooted forest $T - H$

(c) Subtrees $T_{\alpha_1}(H), \ldots, T_{\alpha_8}(H)$

(d) Stump cut set

Figure 1: (a) Tree $T = (\gamma, V, E)$ with root $\gamma = \alpha_1$, vertex set $V = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_8\}$, and set of pruning edges $H = \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, \alpha_4)\}$. (b) The forest $T - H$ obtained from the tree in (a). The stump tree is $T_{\alpha_1}(H)$ with stump set $R = V_\gamma(H) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_7\}$. The root of the stump tree is indicated by a double circle since it coincides with the root of T. (c) Collection of all subtrees $T_\alpha(H)$, $\alpha \in V$, in the forest $T - H$; T and H from (a). (d) The stump cut set for the stump set in (b) is $\partial(R) = \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)\}$. The stump set and the stump cut set are indicated in bold.

in particular, $\partial(V) = \varnothing$. The set of all stump cut sets is

$$\mathcal{C}(T) := \{\partial(R) : R \in \mathcal{R}(T)\}. \tag{3}$$

Obviously, every singleton set $\{e\}$, $e \in E$, is a stump cut set, and every stump cut set C satisfies $C = \partial(V_\gamma(C))$.

Fact 1. A subset H of E is a stump cut set if and only if it satisfies $H = M(H)$, where

$$M(H) := \{e \in H : e \text{ is minimal in } H \text{ with respect to } \preccurlyeq\}, \qquad M(\varnothing) := \varnothing. \tag{4}$$

Proof. Consider a set $H \subseteq E$. Suppose that $H = M(H)$. Then any two edges $e_i, e_j \in H$ $(i \neq j)$ are incomparable with respect to $\preccurlyeq$ (neither $e_i \preccurlyeq e_j$ nor $e_j \preccurlyeq e_i$, $i \neq j$). As a consequence, the corresponding stump set $R = V_\gamma(H)$ of (1) satisfies $\partial(R) = H$, so H is a stump cut set. On the other hand, assume that $H \neq M(H)$. Then there are two edges $e_1 = (\alpha_1, \beta_1)$, $e_2 = (\alpha_2, \beta_2) \in H$ with $e_1 \preccurlyeq e_2$. There is then no $R \in \mathcal{R}(T)$ such that $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in R$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in V \setminus R$, so H cannot be a stump cut set. □

Due to Fact 1, the set of all stump cut sets may be characterised by $\mathcal{C}(T) = \{H \subseteq E : H = M(H)\}$, and we can rewrite (2) as

$$\mathcal{R}(T) = \{V_\gamma(C) : C \in \mathcal{C}(T)\}. \tag{5}$$

Remark 2. $\mathcal{C}(T)$ is the set of all *antichains* of the poset $(E, \preccurlyeq)$, that is, the set of all subsets H of E for which every two distinct elements are incomparable with respect to $\preccurlyeq$. $\diamondsuit$

Fact 2. For every $H \subseteq E$, the components of $T - H$ have the following properties:

(A) $\big(T_\gamma(H)\big)_\alpha(K) = T_\alpha(H \cup K)$, $\alpha \in V_\gamma(H)$, $K \subseteq E_\gamma(H)$

(B) $T_\alpha(H) = T_\alpha(H \cup C)$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(H))$ and $\alpha \notin V_\gamma(H \cup C)$.

These properties carry over to the corresponding vertex sets of the rooted trees.

Proof. (A) is due to a general property of graph decomposition via recursive edge deletion: the order in which edges are deleted does not affect the final object. So $(T - H)(K) = T - (H \cup K)$ for all $H, K \subseteq E$; in particular, the stump tree is the same in both cases. (B) For every $C \in \mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(H))$ and $\alpha \notin V_\gamma(H \cup C)$, we have $C \cap E_\alpha(\varnothing) = \varnothing$ due to Fact 1. But a subtree $T_\alpha(H)$ is not affected by deletion of an edge $e \notin E_\alpha(\varnothing)$. $\square$

2.1 Pruning Poset

From now on, let $T = (\gamma, V, E)$ be fixed and let us investigate the set of all subsets of edges of T, denoted by $\mathcal{P}(E)$. We introduce a partial order $\preceq_P$ on $\mathcal{P}(E)$ and say that $H \preceq_P K$ for any two sets of cut edges $H, K \subseteq E$ when $H = K \cup A$ with $A \subseteq E_\gamma(K)$. In words, $H \preceq_P K$ whenever the additional cuts in $H \setminus K$ occur in the stump tree of the rooted forest $T - K$.

Remark 3. The idea of successively cutting edges within the stump tree of a rooted forest is reminiscent of the cutting-down procedure introduced by Meir and Moon [12]. In [12], the root of a random tree is isolated by uniformly cutting edges of the tree until the tree is reduced to the root. In the resulting line of research (see, for example, [12, 14, 10, 6]), one is interested in the distribution and limiting behaviour of the number of cuts required to isolate the root for various classes of random trees. In contrast, for our pruning, we keep track of the entire rooted forest, rather than the stump tree alone. $\diamondsuit$

The set $\mathcal{P}(E)$ along with the partial order $\preceq_P$ constitutes a poset $\mathbb{P}(T) := (\mathcal{P}(E), \preceq_P)$. Since the cut edges prune the tree (in an intuitive way of thinking), we call $\mathbb{P}(T)$ the *pruning poset* of T. A specific example with corresponding Hasse diagram is shown in Figure 2. For every $K \subseteq E$, we clearly have the isomorphic relation

$$(\{H : H \preceq_P K\}, \preceq_P) \simeq \mathbb{P}(T_\gamma(K)). \tag{6}$$

$\mathbb{P}(T)$ has a maximal element $\varnothing$, which means that $H \preceq_P \varnothing$ for all $H \subseteq E$; but in general no minimal element $\mathbf{0}$, with $\mathbf{0} \preceq_P H$ for all $H \subseteq E$. As a consequence, $\mathbb{P}(T)$ is, in general, not a lattice. Nonetheless, every embedded subposet or *interval*

$$[H, K]_P := \big(\{I \subseteq E : H \preceq_P I \preceq_P K\}, \preceq_P\big), \quad H \preceq_P K$$

of $\mathbb{P}(T)$ is a lattice. We omit the subscript in what follows. Due to (6), we conclude the isomorphic relation $[H, K] \simeq [H \setminus K, \varnothing]$ for any $H \preceq_P K$. It is therefore sufficient to investigate the properties of $[H, \varnothing]$ for every $H \subseteq E$. The interval $[H, \varnothing]$ obviously has maximal element $\varnothing$ and minimal element H. Every path (top to bottom) in $[H, \varnothing]$ represents the possibility to add elements from H in nonincreasing order with respect to $\preccurlyeq$.



Figure 2: Left: Tree T with edges $\{e_1, \ldots, e_4\}$. Right: Hasse diagram for the pruning poset $\mathbb{P}(T)$ of T. The subposet $[H, \varnothing]$ is indicated in bold.

Remark 4. It is clear by construction that every $I \in [H, \varnothing]$ is an ideal of $(H, \succcurlyeq)$, the poset $(H, \succcurlyeq)$ of edges with reversed partial order. Since the elements in $[H, \varnothing]$ are, in addition, ordered by reversed set inclusion, one has

$$[H, \varnothing] = \big(\{I : I \text{ ideal of } (H, \succcurlyeq), \supseteq\big),$$

where $\supseteq$ denotes reversed set inclusion. $\diamondsuit$

Every atom of $[H, \varnothing]$ is of the form $H \setminus \{\nu\}$, where ν is minimal in H with respect to $\preccurlyeq$. As illustrated in Figure 3, $M(H)$, the set of all minimal edges of H from (4), induces a product structure of $[H, \varnothing]$:

$$[H, \varnothing] = \bigtimes_{e \in M(H)} [H_e, \varnothing], \quad \text{with} \quad H_e := \{f \in H : f \succcurlyeq e\}. \tag{7}$$

For $H = \varnothing$, this remains true with the convention that the empty product is the empty set. With the help of this product structure, we can now calculate the Möbius function for the pruning poset. Recall that, for any poset $P = (X, \preccurlyeq)$ and elements $x, y, z \in X$, the Möbius function is recursively defined via

$$\mu(x, x) = 1 \quad \text{and} \qquad \mu(x, y) = -\sum_{x \preccurlyeq \dot{z} \prec y} \mu(x, z), \quad x \prec y, \tag{8}$$

where the underdot indicates the summation variable, see [1, Chap. 4] or [16, Chap. 3] for an introduction to Möbius functions and Möbius inversion.

Theorem 1. *For a given tree $T = (\gamma, V, E)$, the Möbius function for the pruning poset $\mathbb{P}(T)$ is, for every $H, K \subseteq E$ with $H \preceq_P K$, given by*

$$\mu(H, K) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{|H|-|K|}, & \text{if } H \setminus K \in \mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(K)), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Proof. Consider the interval $[H, \varnothing]$ for $H \subseteq E$. Equation (7) together with the elementary product theorem for Möbius functions [16, Prop. 3.8.2] allows one to decompose the Möbius



Figure 3: Left: The interval $[H, \varnothing]$, $H = \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$, of $\mathbb{P}(T)$ from Figure 2. Here, $M(H) = \{\alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ with $H_{\alpha_3} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ and $H_{\alpha_4} = \{\alpha_4\}$. As illustrated on the right-hand side, the interval $[H, \varnothing]$ can be represented as the direct product $[H_{\alpha_3}, \varnothing] \times [H_{\alpha_4}, \varnothing]$.

function into

$$\mu(H, \varnothing) = \prod_{e \in M(H)} \mu(H_e, \varnothing), \tag{10}$$

where $M(H)$ and H_e are defined as in (4) and (7). If $H = \varnothing$, (10) remains true under the usual convention that the empty product is 1. Now assume $H \neq \varnothing$, fix an $e \in M(H)$ and consider the interval $[H_e, \varnothing]$. In contrast to $[H, \varnothing]$, the subinterval $[H_e, \varnothing]$ has a *unique* atom for every choice of e and H; this is $H_e \setminus \{e\}$ (cf. Fig. 3). It follows immediately from (8) that $\mu(H_e, H_e) = 1$ and $\mu(H_e, H_e \setminus \{e\}) = -1$. If $H_e \neq \{e\}$, there is at least one element K with $K \succ_P H_e$ that covers the atom $H_e \setminus \{e\}$. Each interval $[H_e, K]$ is therefore a chain of length two and $\mu(H_e, K) = 0$ by (8). Again by (8), the property $\mu(H_e, I) = 0$ carries over to every other element I with $I \succ_P H_e \setminus \{e\}$. Together with the isomorphic relation $[H, K] \simeq [H \setminus K, \varnothing]$ for $H \preceq_P K$, this yields for every $e \in M(H)$:

$$\mu(H_e, \varnothing) = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } H_e = \{e\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

For $\varnothing \neq H \subseteq E$, the statement $H_e = \{e\}$ for all $e \in H$ is equivalent to $H = M(H)$. We therefore conclude from (10) and (11) that for $H \subseteq E$:

$$\mu(H, \varnothing) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{|H|}, & \text{if } H = M(H), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

which also includes the case $H = \varnothing$ mentioned initially. Let now $H, K \subseteq E$. Again, due to the isomorphism in (6), we obtain from (12) that $\mu(H, K) = (-1)^{|H|-|K|}$ if $H \preceq_P K$ and $H \setminus K = M(H \setminus K)$; $\mu(H, K) = 0$ otherwise. Finally, $H \preceq_P K$ entails $H \setminus K \subseteq E(T_\gamma(K))$. The claim follows from Fact 1. □

Remark 5. Using the more abstract representation of $[H, \varnothing]$ from Remark 4 and the antichain property of stump cut sets of Remark 2, one can also deduce (9) from a very general result for Möbius functions of lattices of the form $(\{I : I \text{ ideal of } P\}, \subseteq)$, P any poset; see

Example 3.9.6 in [16]. We opt for the direct approach here since it is simple and yields additional insight into the structure of the pruning poset. ♢

Now that we have an explicit expression for the Möbius function, we can use Möbius inversion (see [15] or [1, Prop. 4.18]) on $\mathbb{P}(T)$, which for any two functions $f, g\colon \mathcal{P}(E) \to \mathbb{R}$ and any two subsets $H, K \subseteq E$ reads

$$g(K) = \sum_{H \preceq_P K} f(H) \;\Leftrightarrow\; f(K) = \sum_{H \preceq_P K} \mu(H,K)\; g(H). \tag{13}$$

So far, we focussed on the set of all possible subsets of edges of a given tree $T = (\gamma, V, E)$. Let us now shift the perspective to the set of all rooted forests that can be obtained from T by edge deletion. Obviously, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of $\{T - H : H \subseteq E\}$ and those of $\mathcal{P}(E)$. We may thus define the poset $\mathbb{F}(T) := (\{T - H : H \subseteq E\}, \preceq_F)$ by specifying that $T - H \preceq_F T - K$ precisely if $H \preceq_P K$ for $H, K \subseteq E$. It is then clear that $\mathbb{F}(T)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(T)$ by construction. All properties of $\mathbb{P}(T)$, such as isomorphism, the Möbius function in (9), as well as the Möbius inversion formula in (13) therefore carry over to $\mathbb{F}(T)$.

The poset $\mathbb{F}(T)$ is a special case of the *poset of planar forests* introduced by Foissy [8], restricted to what he calls transformations of the second kind and applied to the stump tree only. Foissy also uses Möbius inversion on his more general poset of planar forests. He calculates the Möbius function for small examples, but does not give a general formula. Fortunately, our special case has enough structure to allow for a simple, general and explicit result. This will be the key to an explicit expression for the tree probabilities in the context of the fragmentation process, which we consider next.

3 Fragmentation process

Let us now define the fragmentation process $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ in its discrete and continuous-time versions mentioned initially. The discrete-time process will be denoted by $(\widehat{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ and the continuous-time analogue by $(\check{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$. If statements hold for both of them, we will simply write F instead of $\widehat{F}$ or $\check{F}$.

The state space of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ is $\mathcal{P}(L)$, where $L = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ is the set of discrete objects called links and F_t denotes the set of links that have been removed until time t. The initial state of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ is $F_0 = \varnothing$, the absorbing state is L, and $F_{t'} \subseteq F_t$ for all $t' < t$. If a link $\alpha \in L$ is removed, the remaining set of links is decomposed into the contiguous fragments $\{\beta \in L : \beta < \alpha\}$ and $\{\beta \in L : \beta > \alpha\}$. If all links in $G = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{|G|}\} \subseteq L$ with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \cdots < \alpha_{|G|}$ are removed, G induces a decomposition of the set of remaining fragments of links into

$$\mathcal{L}_G := \big\{J_1, \ldots, J_{|G|+1}\big\}, \tag{14}$$

where

$$J_1 = \{\alpha \in L : \alpha < \alpha_1\}, \quad J_2 = \{\alpha \in L : \alpha_1 < \alpha < \alpha_2\}, \quad \ldots, \quad J_{|G|+1} = \{\alpha \in L : \alpha_{|G|} < \alpha\};$$

in particular, $\mathcal{L}_\varnothing = \{L\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_L = \{\varnothing\}$. Clearly, the J_i may be empty and $\mathcal{L}_G \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ is a partition of $L \setminus G$.



Figure 4: Fragmentation process $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ on the set of subsets of $L = \{1, \dots, 5\}$. Here, $\mathcal{L}_{\{2,3\}} = \{\{1\}, \varnothing, \{4, 5\}\}$.

Definition 1 (Fragmentation process, discrete time)**.** Let r_α, $\alpha \in L$, be positive with $\sum_{\alpha\in L} r_\alpha \leqslant 1$. $(\widehat{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ is the following discrete-time Markov chain with values in $\mathcal{P}(L)$: The initial state is $\widehat{F}_0 = \varnothing$ and, if $\widehat{F}_{t-1} = G$, then

$$\widehat{F}_t = \widehat{F}_{t-1} \cup \Big(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{L}_G} A_t^J \Big).$$

Here $A_t^J = \{\alpha\}$ with probability r_α for all $\alpha \in J$ and $A_t^J = \varnothing$ with probability $1 - \sum_{\alpha\in J} r_\alpha$, independently for all $J \in \mathcal{L}_G$ and all $t \geqslant 1$, and $\mathcal{L}_G$ is defined as in (14).

The definition deals consistently with empty fragments since $A_t^\varnothing = \varnothing$ with probability 1. Links are dependent as long as they belong to the same fragment and become independent once they are separated on different fragments. We can therefore represent $(\widehat{F}_t)_{t\geqslant t'}$ as

$$\widehat{F}_t^L = \widehat{F}_{t'}^L \cup \Big(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{F}_{t'}^L}} \widehat{F}_t^J \Big), \quad t' \geqslant 0,\ t \geqslant t'. \tag{15}$$

The $(\widehat{F}_t^J)_{t\geqslant t'}$'s are independent processes with $\widehat{F}_{t'}^J = \varnothing$ and $(\widehat{F}_t^J)_{t\geqslant t'}$ defined in analogy with $(\widehat{F}_t^L)_{t\geqslant 0} := (\widehat{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$. That is, $(\widehat{F}_t^J)_{t\geqslant t'}$ is the fragmentation process defined on the underlying set of links J with removal probabilities r_α, $\alpha \in J$. Throughout, we use the upper index to indicate the underlying set of links and may omit it if the set is L.

In continuous time, simultaneous events are automatically excluded, so that the links are effectively independent and the fragmentation process simplifies noticeably.

Definition 2 (Fragmentation process, continuous time)**.** Let $\varrho_\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \in L$. $(\breve{F}_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ is the following continuous-time Markov chain with values in $\mathcal{P}(L)$: The initial state is $\breve{F}_0 = \varnothing$, and the transition $\breve{F}_t \longrightarrow \breve{F}_t \cup \{\alpha\}$ happens at rate ϱ_α for every $\alpha \in L \setminus \breve{F}_t$ and $t \geqslant 0$. No other transitions are possible.

Note that we may alternatively say that $\breve{F}_t \longrightarrow \breve{F}_t \cup \{\alpha\}$ happens at rate ϱ_α for every $\alpha \in L$; this indicates that the transitions are independent of the current state.

Our interest is in the probability distribution of $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$. We will throughout rely on a formulation via waiting times. Let $\mathcal{T}_\alpha := \min\{t \geqslant 0 : \alpha \in F_t\}$ be the waiting time for a link α to be removed and $\mathcal{T}_K := \min\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in K\}$ the time at which the first link in $K \subseteq L$ is removed; denote by $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ ($\breve{\mathcal{T}}$) the corresponding discrete-time (continuous-time) versions. The event $\{F_t = G\}$ then obviously translates into

$$\{F_t = G\} = \big\{ \max\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in G\} \leqslant t < \mathcal{T}_{L\setminus G} \big\}, \tag{16}$$

for every $G \subseteq L$ and $t \geqslant 0$. In continuous time, each $\alpha \in L$ is independently removed after an exponential waiting time $\check{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha$ with parameter ϱ_α; the explicit expression for the probability of (16) is therefore immediate:

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\check{F}_t = G\big) = \prod_{\beta \in L\setminus G} \mathbf{P}\big(\check{\mathcal{T}}_\beta > t\big) \prod_{\alpha \in G} \mathbf{P}\big(\check{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha \leqslant t\big) = \exp\Big(-\sum_{\alpha \in L\setminus G} \varrho_\alpha\, t\Big) \prod_{\alpha \in G} \big(1 - \exp(-\varrho_\alpha\, t)\big). \tag{17}$$

In discrete time, however, links are in not independent in general and dependencies change over time, such that $\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t = G\big)$ fails to be an analogue of (17). As mentioned in the Introduction, interest therefore shifts to classes of realisations of the fragmentation process that end up in the state G at time t and that agree on the time order of some events. Each such set will be represented by a rooted binary tree. This will be done next.

3.1 Fragmentation trees

From now on, let us consider the vertex set of a tree as a subset G of $L = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and equip it with a left-to-right order according to $\leqslant$. Any tree $T = (\gamma, G, E)$ is then a plane oriented tree. Let us, moreover, add information to the trees about the remaining set of links $L \setminus G$ and the fragments induced by subsets of G as follows.

Let $\mathcal{S} := \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{R}(T) \cup \varnothing} \mathcal{L}_R$, where $\mathcal{R}(T)$ is the set of stump sets as in (2) or (5), and where $\mathcal{L}_R$ is defined as in (14). Cleary, $\mathcal{S}$ depends on T, but we suppress the dependence on T in the notation. A *fragmentation tree* $T^L := (\gamma, G, E, L)$ corresponding to the tree $T = (\gamma, G, E)$ is then the augmented planted plane tree constructed as follows (see Fig. 5 for an example):

- Add additional lines to T such that every vertex $\alpha \in G$ has exactly two lines emanating from it. We call these additional lines *branches* and distinguish them from edges. More precisely, a *branch* has a lower end and no upper end in the vertex set of T, whereas an edge always connects two vertices.
- Add a *phantom* node r to the tree. That is, r is the parent of γ, but does not count as a vertex (this makes T^L a planted plane tree [5]). Connect r and γ by a branch.
- Associate every line (edge or branch) with a fragment $J \in \mathcal{S}$ according to the following rules: Start with the line between r and γ and identify it with $I_\gamma = L$. Next, associate the two lines emanating from γ with the fragment $I_\gamma^l := \{\beta \in I_\gamma : \beta < \gamma\}$ and $I_\gamma^r := \{\beta \in I_\gamma : \beta > \gamma\}$: so I_γ^l is the left and I_γ^r the right branch or edge, and $I_\gamma = I_\gamma^l \cup \{\gamma\} \cup I_\gamma^r$ as well as $\mathcal{L}_{\{\gamma\}} = \{I_\gamma^l, I_\gamma^r\}$. If γ has a child $\alpha \in G$ ($\beta \in G$) with $\alpha < \gamma$ ($\gamma < \beta$), we set $I_\gamma^l =: I_\alpha$ ($I_\gamma^r =: I_\beta$) and proceed up the tree in a recursive way by identifying all remaining lines with the (possibly empty) fragments $J \in \mathcal{S}$ in an analogous way, starting with the lines emanating from the child(ren) of γ.

Clearly, $\mathcal{S}$ is the set of all (possibly empty) fragments that emerge when links are removed from L in the order prescribed by T. For every $\alpha \in G$, the fragment I_α is the smallest fragment in $\mathcal{S}$ that contains α, i.e. the particular fragment from which link $\alpha \in G$ is removed. I_α will be understood as *internal fragment*. The fragments in $\mathcal{L}_G$, namely those that are associated with branches rather than edges, will be termed *external fragment*.



Figure 5: Left: Plane oriented tree $T = (\gamma, G, E)$ with vertex set $G = \{1, 3, 4\}$ and root $\gamma = 3$. Right: The corresponding fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ for $L = \{1, \ldots, 6\}$. Here, $\mathcal{S} = \{I_3, I_1, I_4, \varnothing, I_1^r, I_4^r\}$.

External fragments $J \in \mathcal{L}_G$ can be either *full* (if $J \neq \varnothing$) or *empty* (if $J = \varnothing$). For $G = \varnothing$, the only fragmentation tree is the empty planted tree (with no node except the phantom node r and the single line I_γ).

Due to the above description, we can rewrite $\mathcal{S}$ in various ways, namely,

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{R}(T) \cup \varnothing} \mathcal{L}_R = \{I_\gamma\} \cup \{I_\alpha^l, I_\alpha^r : \alpha \in G\} = \{I_\alpha : \alpha \in G\} \cup \mathcal{L}_G \,.$$

In a similar manner, we can write $\mathcal{L}_R$, $R \in \mathcal{R}(T)$, as a collection of external fragments and internal fragments, namely

$$\mathcal{L}_R = \Big(\mathcal{L}_G \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{\alpha \in M(G \setminus R)} \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(\varnothing)} \Big)\Big) \cup \big\{I_\alpha : \alpha \in M(G \setminus R)\big\}, \tag{18}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_R^{I_\alpha}$ is defined as in (14) with L replaced by I_α, $\alpha \in G$, and $M(G \setminus R)$ is the set of vertices $G \setminus R$ that are minimal with respect to $\preccurlyeq$ (set $M(\varnothing) := \varnothing$); that is, M is the vertex counterpart of (4) and denoted by the same symbol by slight abuse of notation. Note that $G_\alpha(\varnothing) = G \cap I_\alpha$.

Remark 6. Our fragmentation trees correspond to the *tree topologies* that occurred in [3]. In the genealogical context, a tree topology means an unweighted tree. We slightly adjusted the notation here for compatibility with the general usage in graph theory. ♢

Since the notions stump set, stump cut set, etc. from Section 2 depend on edges and vertices alone, they are not affected by additional lines that are attached to the trees. All notions from Section 2 therefore carry over to fragmentation trees. Edge cutting, as the word suggests, still refers to cutting edges, not branches. For every $H \subseteq E$ and $\alpha \in G$, the subtree $T_\alpha^L(H)$ with root α and vertex set $G_\alpha(H)$ contains information about the fragments in $\mathcal{S}^{I_\alpha} := \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{R}(T_\alpha(H)) \cup \varnothing} \mathcal{L}_R^{I_\alpha}$. The fragmentation tree $T_\alpha^L(H)$ has phantom node r_α (where we set $r_\gamma := r$ for consistency). A *fragmentation forest* $T^L - H$ of T^L is then the disjoint collection of fragmentation trees $T_\alpha^L(H)$, where either $\alpha = \gamma$, or α is an upper end of an edge in H. Since edge deletion for fragmentation trees is performed in the same way as for

the trees in Section 2, the poset of fragmentation forests $\mathbb{F}(T^L) := (\{T^L - H : H \subseteq E\}, \preceq_F)$ equipped with the partial order defined in Section 2.1 is once more isomorphic to the pruning poset $\mathbb{P}(T)$.

We now match realisations of the fragmentation process with fragmentation trees. Recall that $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ is the waiting time until link α is removed and that $\mathcal{T}_K$, $K \subseteq L$, is the waiting time until the first link in K is removed.

Definition 3. For a given $t \geqslant 0$, we say that $(F_{t'})_{0 \leqslant t' \leqslant t}$ *matches* the fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ if $F_t = G$ and $\mathcal{T}_\alpha \leqslant \mathcal{T}_\beta$ precisely for those $\alpha, \beta \in G$ with $\alpha \preccurlyeq \beta$; in words, if the partial order of the waiting times with respect to links on the same path away from the root agrees with the partial order of the vertices of the fragmentation tree. That is, we do not care about the order of the waiting times for links that are already separated on different fragments.



Figure 6: All realisations of the fragmentation process that end up in the state $F_t = \{1, 3, 4\}$ at time t and for which 3 is removed before 1 and 4 match the fragmentation tree on the right.

Let now $\tau(G, L)$ be the set of all fragmentation trees with vertex set G and underlying link set L (the cardinality of this set is the Catalan number $C_{|G|} = \frac{1}{|G|+1}\binom{2|G|}{|G|}$). We can then expand (16) into

$$\{F_t = G\} = \bigcup_{T^L \in \tau(G,L)} \{F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\}, \quad G \subseteq L,$$

where

$$\{F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\} = \big\{ \max\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in G\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{L \setminus G},\, \mathcal{T}_\alpha = \mathcal{T}_{G_\alpha(\varnothing)} \text{ for all } \alpha \in G \big\} \tag{19}$$

is the event that $(F_t)_{0 \leqslant t' \leqslant t}$ matches T^L. Indeed, the *inequalities* in (19) ensure that precisely the vertices in G have been removed before t. The *equalities* then enforce the partial order within the tree by requiring that α be the first link to be removed in the subtree with root α (which has vertex set $G_\alpha(\varnothing)$); it is sufficient to look at the links in $G_\alpha(\varnothing)$ since we know from the inequalities that those in $I_\alpha \setminus G_\alpha(\varnothing)$ are not cut until t anyway.

The task for the remainder of this section is to find an explicit expression for $\mathbf{P}(F_t \leftrightarrow T^L)$. To this end, with the help of Möbius inversion on the pruning poset, we will write the maximum in (19) in terms of minima over certain subsets of G. This is motivated by the fact that the minimum of a collection of independent exponential (or geometric) random variables is independent of the order in which the events take place, whereas the respective maximum is not. But the details are quite different in continuous and discrete time. We therefore first set up a more general framework that covers both situations.

3.2 Tree probabilities via Möbius inversion

Consider a fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$. Let $\Gamma := G \cup \mathcal{S}$ and assign to every element $s \in \Gamma$ some event (in the sense of a finite set) $B(s)$. We will throughout abbreviate $B(\{\alpha\}) =: B(\alpha)$ and $\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}} B(J) =: B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big)$ for $\alpha \in G$, $H \subseteq E$. At this point, we neither give a meaning nor a law to the events, but will assume that the events are *nested* according to the set structure, i.e., that

$$B(s_1) \subseteq B(s_2) \text{ if and only if } s_1 \subseteq s_2 \subseteq \Gamma. \tag{20}$$

Note that in general $B(s_1) \cup B(s_2) \neq B(s_1 \cup s_2)$, in particular $B(I'_\alpha) \cup B(\alpha) \cup B(I''_\alpha) \subseteq B(I_\alpha)$, but equality need not hold. Let Ξ be the set generated from $\{B(s) : s \in \Gamma\}$ by arbitrary unions and set exclusions. The event $B(I_\alpha) \setminus B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big)$ will often be required. Let us state the following fact.

Fact 3. For events nested according to (20) we have $B(\mathcal{L}_A) \subseteq B(\mathcal{L}_G)$ for $G \subseteq A \subseteq L$. Moreover, for every $\alpha \in G$, $H \subseteq E$, the following properties hold:

(A) $B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big) \subseteq B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H \cup K)}\big) \subseteq B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{\varnothing}\big) = B(I_\alpha)$ for $K \subseteq E$.

(B) $B(\beta) \subseteq B(I_\alpha) \setminus B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big)$ for all $\beta \in G_\alpha(H)$.

(C) $B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\beta}_{G_\beta(H)}\big) \subseteq B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big)$ for all $\beta \in G_\alpha(H)$.

Proof. Let $G \subseteq A \subseteq L$. By definition of $\mathcal{L}_A$ and $\mathcal{L}_G$, for any $J \in \mathcal{L}_A$ there is an $I \in \mathcal{L}_G$ such that $J \subseteq I$ and thus $B(J) \subseteq B(I)$ by (20). (A) follows from the latter statement since $\varnothing \subseteq G_\alpha(H \cup K) \subseteq G_\alpha(H)$ for any $\alpha \in G$, $H, K \subseteq E$, and because $\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{\varnothing} = \{I_\alpha\}$. (B): Let $\beta \in G_\alpha(H)$ for some $\alpha \in G$. Since $\beta \in I_\beta \subseteq I_\alpha$, we know $B(\beta) \subseteq B(I_\beta) \subseteq B(I_\alpha)$ by (20). On the other hand, $\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)} \setminus \varnothing$ is a partition of $I_\alpha \setminus G_\alpha(H)$, so $\beta \notin J$ for any $J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}$ and thus $B(\beta) \nsubseteq B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big)$ by (20). (C) follows from (20) and the fact that $\mathcal{L}^{I_\beta}_{G_\beta(H)} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}$ for all $\beta \in G_\alpha(H)$. □

Let now $\mathcal{T} : \Xi \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ be a function that assigns a scalar to each event in Ξ. Later, $\mathcal{T}$ will turn into the waiting time for the event and thus generalise the previous meaning of $\mathcal{T}$, but here we are not tied to an underlying process. Let us write $\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{G})$ and assume that

$$\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{G} \leqslant \mathcal{T}_\mathcal{H} \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G} \in \Xi. \tag{21}$$

Our object of interest in this section is the event $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(H) \cap m_B(H)$, where

$$\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(H) := \big\{ \max\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} : \alpha \in G_\gamma(H)\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})} \big\}, \quad G \subseteq L, \quad t \geqslant 0, \tag{22}$$

and

$$m_B(H) := \bigcap_{\alpha \in G} \big\{ \mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B(I_\alpha) \setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})} \big\}, \quad H \subseteq E. \tag{23}$$

We will see later that $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(H) \cap m_B(H)$ generalises the tree event in (19). Let us only mention here that (23) may be understood as an order relation within each of the connected components of $T^L - H$. Our aim is to express $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(H) \cap m_B(H)$ in terms of a collection of certain minima combined with order relations, via an inclusion-exclusion principle. The order relations are those just defined, and the minima are analogous to the maxima, namely

$$\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(H) := \big\{ \min\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} : \alpha \in G_\gamma(H)\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\}, \quad H \subseteq L, \quad t \geqslant 0. \tag{24}$$

We will proceed in the opposite direction and start with a decomposition of the joint event of the form $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(H) \cap m_B(H)$ into a collection of maxima and then apply Möbius inversion on $\mathbb{P}(T)$ from (13). Anticipating that the stump set will play a special role in our final tree probabilities, we formulate the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ be a fragmentation tree and $K \subseteq E$. If (20) and (21) are satisfied, then*

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(K) \cap m_B(K)\big) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(K))} \mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K \cup C) \cap m_B(K \cup C)\big), \tag{25}$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ denotes a probability measure on Ξ and $\mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(K))$ is from (3).

Proof. We will decompose the probability for the joint event $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(K) \cap m_B(K)$ part by part. We first express the minimum in $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(K)$ in terms maxima using the well-known disjoint decomposition, which here reads

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\min\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} : \alpha \in G_\gamma(K)\} \leqslant t\} \\ &\quad = \bigcup_{\varnothing \neq A \subseteq G_\gamma(K)} \{\max\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} : \alpha \in A\} \leqslant t,\, t < \min\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\beta)} : \beta \in G_\gamma(K) \setminus A\}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

We now intersect both sides of (26) with $m_B(K)$ and then evaluate the probability. Since

$$m_B(K) \subseteq \{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} \leqslant \mathcal{T}_{B(\beta)} \text{ for all } \alpha \in G \text{ and } \beta \in G_\alpha(K)\} \tag{27}$$

by Fact 3 (B), we have

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\big\{ \max\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} : \alpha \in A\} \leqslant t,\, t < \min\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\beta)} : \beta \in G_\gamma(K) \setminus A\}\big\} \cap m_B(K)\big) = 0$$

for every subset $A \subseteq G$ that does not contain the root, or is not contiguous with respect to the partial order on $T^L_\gamma(K)$, that is, if A is not a stump set of $T^L_\gamma(K)$. Using (27) once more, we conclude that

$$\big\{ \min\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\beta)} : \beta \in G_\gamma(K) \setminus R\big\}\big\} \cap m_B(K) = \big\{ \min\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\beta)} : \beta \in M(G_\gamma(K) \setminus R)\big\}\big\} \cap m_B(K);$$

recall that $M(G_\gamma(K) \setminus R)$ is the vertex counterpart of (4). We may thus write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(K) \cap m_B(K)\big) &= \sum_{R\in\mathcal{R}(T_\gamma^L(K))} \mathbf{P}\big(\{\max\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} : \alpha \in R\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(K)})},\\ &\qquad t < \min\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\beta)} : \beta \in M(G_\gamma(K)\setminus R)\}\} \cap m_B(K)\big)\\ &= \sum_{R\in\mathcal{R}(T_\gamma^L(K))} \mathbf{P}\big(\{\max\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} : \alpha \in R\} \leqslant t < \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(K)})},\\ &\qquad t < \min\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(I_\beta)\setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\beta}_{G_\beta(K)})} : \beta \in M(G_\gamma(K)\setminus R)\big\}\big\} \cap m_B(K)\big)\\ &= \sum_{R\in\mathcal{R}(T_\gamma^L(K))} \mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K) \cap m_B(K)\big).\end{aligned}$$

The second equality is due to the intersection with $m_B(K)$, see (23). In the third step, we used that

$$B(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(K)}) \bigcup_{\beta\in M(G_\gamma(K)\setminus R)} B(I_\beta) \setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\beta}_{G_\beta(K)}) = B(\mathcal{L}_R)\,,$$

which follows by (18) applied to the stump tree $T_\gamma^L(K)$ with the help of Fact 2 (A). Altogether this gives

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(K) \cap m_B(K)\big) = \sum_{C\in\mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(K))} \mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K\cup C) \cap m_B(K)\big) \tag{28}$$

due to (5) and Fact 2 (A). Let us finally consider the ordering relation $m_B(K)$ in the joint event on the right-hand side of (28). Consider first an $\alpha \notin G_\gamma(K\cup C)$, in which case we obtain $B(I_\alpha) \setminus B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K)}\big) = B(I_\alpha) \setminus B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K\cup C)}\big)$ by Fact 2 (B). For an $\alpha \in G_\gamma(K\cup C)$, we have $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K\cup C) \subseteq \{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} < \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(K\cup C)})}\}$. Since furthermore $\mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(K\cup C)})} \leqslant \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K\cup C)})}$ by Fact 3 (C), we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K\cup C) \cap \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} &= \mathcal{T}_{B(I_\alpha)\setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K)})}\big\}\\ &= \mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K\cup C) \cap \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{\left(B(I_\alpha)\setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K)})\right)\setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K\cup C)})}\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since furthermore

$$\big(B(I_\alpha) \setminus B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K)}\big)\big) \setminus B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K\cup C)}\big) = B(I_\alpha) \setminus B\big(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(K\cup C)}\big)$$

by Fact 3 (A), we can rewrite the joint event as

$$\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K\cup C) \cap m_B(K) = \mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K\cup C) \cap m_B(K\cup C).$$

Together with (28) this completes the proof. □

Theorem 2. *Under the conditions of Lemma 1, the following holds for every $K \subseteq E$:*

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B}(K) \cap m_B(K)\big) = \sum_{H\subseteq E_\gamma(K)} (-1)^{|H|}\, \mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B}(H\cup K) \cap m_B(H\cup K)\big).$$

Proof. Recall the Möbius function μ for the pruning poset $\mathbb{P}(T)$ in (9) and rewrite it as $\mu(H,K)\,(-1)^{|H|-|K|} = \mathbb{1}_{\{H\setminus K\,\in\,\mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(K))\}}$ for $H, K \subseteq E, H \preceq_P K$. This allows to reformulate (25) from Lemma 1 as

$$\begin{aligned}(-1)^{|K|}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B}(K)\,\cap\,m_B(K)\big)&\\ &= (-1)^{|K|}\sum_{H\subseteq E}\mathbb{1}_{\{H\setminus K\,\in\,\mathcal{C}(T_\gamma(K))\}}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(H)\,\cap\,m_B(H)\big)\\ &= \sum_{H\preceq_P K}\mu(H,K)\,(-1)^{|H|}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(H)\,\cap\,m_B(H)\big),\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

where the last equality is due to isomorphism on $\mathbb{P}(T_\gamma(H))$ in (6). Möbius inversion on $\mathbb{P}(T)$ (cf. (13)) then yields the inverse of (29):

$$\begin{aligned}(-1)^{|K|}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(K)\,\cap\,m_B(K)\big) &= \sum_{H\preceq_P K}(-1)^{|H|}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B}(H)\,\cap\,m_B(H)\big)\\ &= \sum_{H\subseteq E_\gamma(K)}(-1)^{|H\cup K|}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B}(H\cup K)\,\cap\,m_B(H\cup K)\big),\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is once more isomorphism on $\mathbb{P}(T_\gamma(H))$. □

We can now use Theorem 2 to evaluate the tree probabilities in (19). To this end, we define events for the fragmentation process as $B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(s) := \{s\}$ for all $s \in \Gamma$, so that $\mathcal{T}_{B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(s)} = \mathcal{T}_s$ is the waiting time at which the first link in s is removed under $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$. Since $L \setminus G = \cup_{J\in\mathcal{L}_G} J$, we then have

$$\mathcal{T}_{L\setminus G} = \min\big\{\mathcal{T}_J : J \in \mathcal{L}_G\big\} = \min\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(J)} : J \in \mathcal{L}_G\big\} = \mathcal{T}_{B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(\mathcal{L}_G)}.\tag{30}$$

Likewise, since

$$G_\alpha(H) = I_\alpha \setminus \big\{J : J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big\} = B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(I_\alpha) \setminus B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}),\tag{31}$$

one has

$$\mathcal{T}_{G_\alpha(H)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(I_\alpha)\setminus B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}.\tag{32}$$

These seemingly more complicated expressions allow us to rewrite $\{F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\}$ from (19) as the generalised tree event

$$\{F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\} = \mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}}(\varnothing)\,\cap\,m_{B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}}(\varnothing)\tag{33}$$

with $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}}$ and $m_{B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}}$ as defined in (22) and (23), and B replaced by $B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}$.

Corollary 1. *Let $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ and $t \geqslant 0$ be given. The probability that $(F_t)_{0\leqslant t'\leqslant t}$ matches T^L is then given by*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\big(F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big) &= \sum_{H\subseteq E}(-1)^{|H|}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}}(H)\,\cap\,m_{B_{\scriptscriptstyle F}}(H)\big)\\ &= \sum_{H\subseteq E}(-1)^{|H|}\,\mathbf{P}\big(\mathcal{T}_{G_\gamma(H)}\leqslant t,\,t<\mathcal{T}_{L\setminus G_\gamma(H)},\;\mathcal{T}_\alpha=\mathcal{T}_{G_\alpha(H)}\;\forall\;\alpha\in G\big).\end{aligned}\tag{34}$$

The probability of a fragmentation tree T^L can thus be expressed as an alternating sum over all probabilities corresponding to fragmentation forests that can be obtained from T^L by edge deletion. For every given fragmentation forest $T^L - H$, the ordering relation may be rewritten as

$$m_{B_F}(H) = \bigcap_{T^L_\alpha(H) \in T^L - H} \; \bigcap_{\nu \in G_\alpha(H)} \{\mathcal{T}_\nu = \mathcal{T}_{G_\nu(H)}\},$$

which shows that the ordering is now prescribed within each component of $T^L - H$, in contrast to (19), which prescribes the ordering within the entire tree. The joint event $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_F}(H) \cap m_{B_F}(H)$ thus means that at least one link in the stump tree has been removed until time t, all the links in $L \setminus G_\gamma(H)$ are still intact, and the events corresponding to the vertices in G happen in the prescribed order within each component. This interpretation holds for discrete and continuous time alike.

Proof. Choosing $B_F(s) = \{s\}$ for all $s \in \Gamma$ clearly satisfies the nesting condition (20). Furthermore, choosing $\mathcal{T}$ as the waiting time for the events B_F guarantees (21). We may thus use Theorem 2 and apply it to (33), that is, for $K = \varnothing$. This yields

$$\mathbf{P}\big(F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big) = \mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_F}(\varnothing) \cap m_{B_F}(\varnothing)\big) = \sum_{H \subseteq E} (-1)^{|H|}\; \mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_F}(H) \cap m_{B_F}(H)\big)$$

with $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_F}$ from (24). Employing (30) and (32) once more, this time in the reverse direction, completes the proof. □

Continuous time An explicit expression for the tree probabilities in continuous time now transpires without much effort due to the independence of the waiting times. Let us denote by $\{\breve{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\}$ the continuous-time version of (19).

Proposition 1. *For a given fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ and a fixed $t \geqslant 0$, one has $\mathbf{P}\big(\breve{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big) = \exp(-\sum_{\alpha \in L} \varrho_\alpha\, t)$ for $G = \varnothing$ and, for every $\varnothing \neq G \subseteq L$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\breve{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big) = \sum_{H \subseteq E} (-1)^{|H|} \Big(1 - \exp\Big(-\sum_{\alpha \in G_\gamma(H)} \varrho_\alpha\, t\Big)\Big) \exp\Big(-\sum_{\beta \in L \setminus G_\gamma(H)} \varrho_\beta\, t\Big) \prod_{\alpha \in G} \frac{\varrho_\alpha}{\sum_{\nu \in G_\alpha(H)} \varrho_\nu}.$$

Proof. For a fixed $H \subseteq E$, consider the event $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_F}(H) \cap m_{B_F}(H)$ on the right-hand side of (34), which is $\breve{\mathrm{MIN}}_{t,\,B_F}(H) \cap \breve{m}_{B_F}(H)$ in continuous time. Recall that the waiting times for the links are independent and that the minimum of a collection of independent exponential waiting times is independent of the order in which the events appear. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\big(\breve{\mathrm{MIN}}_{t,\,B_F}(H) \cap \breve{m}_{B_F}(H)\big) = \mathbf{P}\big(\min\{\breve{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha : \alpha \in G_\gamma(H)\} \leqslant t\big)\; \mathbf{P}\big(\breve{\mathcal{T}}_\beta > t,\ \beta \in L \setminus G_\gamma(H)\big) \\ \times \prod_{\alpha \in G} \mathbf{P}\big(\breve{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha \leqslant \breve{\mathcal{T}}_\beta,\ \beta \in G_\alpha(H)\big),\end{aligned}$$

which can be evaluated in an elementary manner, with the help of the independent exponential laws of the $\breve{\mathcal{T}}$'s. Together with Corollary 1, this completes the proof. □

Discrete time We now turn to the discrete-time process. In discrete time, the links are dependent as long as they belong to the same fragment. The probability that nothing happens in a given time step is

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_{t+1} = G \mid \widehat{F}_t = G\big) = \prod_{J \in \mathcal{L}_G} \big(1 - r_J\big) =: \lambda_G, \quad r_J := \sum_{\alpha \in J} r_\alpha. \tag{35}$$

Due to the triangular structure, the λ_G's are the eigenvalues of the Markov transition matrix of $\widehat{F}$. The λ_G's have previously been identified by Ljubič [11] in the context of population genetics.

The law of links to be added to $\widehat{F}_t$ changes over time and (34) can not be evaluated in a straightforward manner. To see this, suppose that, in some time step, link $\gamma \notin \{1, n\}$ is removed. Then L splits into the two nonempty fragments $I_\gamma^l = \{\beta \in L : \beta < \gamma\}$ and $I_\gamma^r = \{\beta \in L : \beta > \gamma\}$. After removal of γ, the probability that a link in I_γ^l or I_γ^r is removed is $1 - \lambda_\gamma^L = r_{I_\gamma^l} + r_{I_\gamma^r} - r_{I_\gamma^l} \cdot r_{I_\gamma^r}$, whereas before removal of γ it is $r_{I_\gamma^l} + r_{I_\gamma^r} = 1 - \lambda_\gamma^L + r_{I_\gamma^l} \cdot r_{I_\gamma^r}$. We may thus think of $1 - \lambda_\gamma^L$ as the probability for a removal in $L \setminus \{\gamma\}$ when I_γ^l and I_γ^r are independent and of $r_{I_\gamma^l} \cdot r_{I_\gamma^r}$ as the additional probability for the case that the fragments are still dependent. We generalise the idea of a decomposition into dependent and independent parts in the next section.

3.3 The auxiliary process

We now construct an auxiliary process, which is state independent, and which jointly represents all transitions of interest for the discrete-time fragmentation process and a given fragmentation tree. The method is reminiscent of that used by Clifford and Sudbury [4], who jointly represent *all* transitions of a given Markov chain, provided it is monotone and has a totally ordered state space. The state space of $(F_t)_{t \geqslant 0}$, however, is only partially ordered; we therefore need a version that works on a tree-by-tree basis. We then use the auxiliary process to construct realisations of $(\widehat{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ that are compatible with a given fragmentation tree up to time t and express matching events of the fragmentation process in terms of events of the auxiliary process.

3.3.1 Construction of the auxiliary process

Fix a fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$. We aim at a construction of a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ where, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, X_t will be a family $X_t = (X_t^J)_{J \in \mathcal{S}}$, and the X_t^J's will have a specific dependence for the J's. We construct this collection for every $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ inductively, starting with the (full or empty) external fragments of the tree and proceeding in a top-down manner.

For the start, let $t > 0$ be fixed and define X_t^J for each external fragments $J \in \mathcal{L}_G$ independently for each J on $\Omega^J := \{\omega_\varnothing^J, \omega_J^J\}$ with

$$X_t^J = \begin{cases} \omega_\varnothing^J, & \text{with probability } 1 - r_J, \\ \omega_J^J, & \text{with probability } r_J. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

If $J = \varnothing$, then obviously $X_t^J = \omega_\varnothing^\varnothing$ with probability 1 (for consistency, set $r_\varnothing := 0$). Now consider the internal fragments I_α, $\alpha \in G$. As already mentioned, every fragment may be pieced together from its two descendant fragments $I_\alpha^l = \{\beta \in I_\alpha : \beta < \alpha\}$ and $I_\alpha^r = \{\beta \in I_\alpha : \beta > \alpha\}$. Namely, $I_\alpha = I_\alpha^l \cup \{\alpha\} \cup I_\alpha^r$; I_α^l and I_α^r may be internal fragments or (empty or full) external fragments. We now proceed down the tree inductively by taking, in every step, one α, for which $X_t^{I_\alpha^l}$ and $X_t^{I_\alpha^r}$ have already been defined (as independent processes on $\Omega^{I_\alpha^l}$ and $\Omega^{I_\alpha^r}$). $X_t^{I_\alpha}$ will live on the state space $\Omega^{I_\alpha} := \left\{\omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha}, \omega_\alpha^{I_\alpha}, \omega_{\mathrm{ind}}^{I_\alpha}, \omega_{\mathrm{dep}}^{I_\alpha}\right\}$, and we define the composite event $\omega_{I_\alpha}^{I_\alpha} := \Omega^{I_\alpha} \setminus \omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha}$, which blends in with the notation in (36). By slight abuse of notation, we will sometimes write $X_t^J = \omega_J^J$ for a $J \in \mathcal{S}$ even though the correct statement would be $X_t^J \in \omega_J^J$ if J is an internal fragment, and $X_t^J = \omega_J^J$ if J is an external fragment. We now construct $X_t^{I_\alpha}$ by specifying

$$X_t^{I_\alpha} = \omega_{\mathrm{ind}}^{I_\alpha} \quad \text{if } X_t^{I_\alpha^l} = \omega_{I_\alpha^l}^{I_\alpha^l} \quad \text{or} \quad X_t^{I_\alpha^r} = \omega_{I_\alpha^r}^{I_\alpha^r}$$

(this is the case with probability $1 - \lambda_\alpha^{I_\alpha}$) and, if $X_t^{I_\alpha^l} = \omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha^l}$ and $X_t^{I_\alpha^r} = \omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha^r}$ (which is the case with probability $\lambda_\alpha^{I_\alpha}$), we set

$$X_t^{I_\alpha} = \begin{cases} \omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha}, & \text{with probability } {}^{(1-r_{I_\alpha})}/_{\lambda_\alpha^{I_\alpha}}, \\ \omega_\alpha^{I_\alpha}, & \text{with probability } {}^{r_\alpha}/_{\lambda_\alpha^{I_\alpha}}, \\ \omega_{\mathrm{dep}}^{I_\alpha}, & \text{with probability } {}^{r_{I_\alpha^l} \cdot r_{I_\alpha^r}}/_{\lambda_\alpha^{I_\alpha}} \end{cases}$$

independently of what has been decided for the previous fragments. Here, $\lambda_\alpha^{I_\alpha}$ is defined as in (35), but with respect to the link set I_α of the tree with root α. This means that $\Omega^{I_\alpha^l} \times \Omega^{I_\alpha^r} \setminus (\omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha^r})$ is identified with the event $\omega_{\mathrm{ind}}^{I_\alpha}$, whereas the remaining element $(\omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha^r})$ is 'split up' into the elements of $\Omega^{I_\alpha} \setminus \omega_{\mathrm{ind}}^{I_\alpha}$.

We see that under this construction, $X_t^{I_\alpha}$ has the law

$$X_t^{I_\alpha} = \begin{cases} \omega_\varnothing^{I_\alpha}, & \text{with probability } 1 - r_{I_\alpha}, \\ \omega_\alpha^{I_\alpha}, & \text{with probability } r_\alpha, \\ \omega_{\mathrm{dep}}^{I_\alpha}, & \text{with probability } r_{I_\alpha^l} \cdot r_{I_\alpha^r}, \\ \omega_{\mathrm{ind}}^{I_\alpha} & \text{with probability } 1 - \lambda_\alpha^{I_\alpha}. \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

The construction is completed when $X_t^L = X_t^{I_\gamma}$ has been reached. Altogether, we then have the family $X_t = (X_t^J)_{J \in \mathcal{S}}$ with state space $\Omega := \times_{J \in \mathcal{S}} \Omega^J$. The sequence of random variables $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is defined to be i.i.d. in t. The X_t^J are independent for all disjoint fragments; in particular, for every stump set $R \in \mathcal{R}(T^L)$, the family $(X_t^J)_{J \in \mathcal{L}_R}$ with state space $\times_{J \in \mathcal{L}_R} \Omega^J$ is independent. In contrast, for nondisjoint fragments there are dependencies, such as

$$X_t^{I_\alpha} \in \Omega^{I_\alpha} \setminus \omega_{\mathrm{ind}}^{I_\alpha} \text{ for } \alpha \in G \text{ implies } X_t^J = \omega_\varnothing^J \text{ for all } J \in \mathcal{S}^{I_\alpha} \setminus I_\alpha. \tag{38}$$

The other way round, this means

$$X_t^J \neq \omega_\varnothing^J \text{ for some } J \in \mathcal{S}^{I_\alpha} \setminus I_\alpha \text{ implies } X_t^{I_\alpha} \in \omega_{I_\alpha}^{I_\alpha}. \tag{39}$$



Figure 7: Fragmentation tree with vertex set $G = \{3,4\}$, link set $L = \{1,\ldots,5\}$, internal fragments I_3 and I_4, and external fragments I_3^l, I_4^l and I_4^r. Here, $\mathcal{L}^{I_4}_{G_4(\varnothing)} = \{I_4^l, I_4^r\}$.

Events and Waiting times. We now define events $B_X(s)$ for all $s \in \Gamma$ based on the process X_t. To this end, define $\pi_I : \Omega \to \Omega^I$, $I \in \mathcal{S}$, as the canonical projection. We set for all $\alpha \in G$ and $J \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$B_X(\alpha) := \Big\{\omega \in \Omega : \pi_{I_\alpha}(\omega) = \omega_\alpha^{I_\alpha}\Big\}, \qquad B_X(J) := \Big\{\omega \in \Omega : \pi_J(\omega) = \omega_J^J\Big\}.$$

Due to (38) and (39), these events satisfy the nesting condition (20).

Example 1. Consider the fragmentation tree in Figure 7. For every $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, X_t is given by the family $X_t = \Big(X_t^{I_3^l}, X_t^{I_4^l}, X_t^{I_4^r}, X_t^{I_4}, X_t^{I_3}\Big)$. Events $\omega \in \Omega$ that satisfy $\mathbf{P}(X_t = \omega) > 0$ are

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_\varnothing^4, \omega_\varnothing^{I_3}\Big), & \Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4}, \omega_3^{I_3}\Big), & \Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{dep}}^{I_3}\Big), \\
\Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_4^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), & \Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_{\text{dep}}^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), & \Big(\omega_{I_3^l}^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), \\
\Big(\omega_{I_3^l}^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_4^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), & \Big(\omega_{I_3^l}^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_{\text{dep}}^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), & \Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_{I_4^r}^{I_4^r}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), \\
\Big(\omega_{I_3^l}^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_{I_4^r}^{I_4^r}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big). &&
\end{array}$$

Events of interest are, for example,

$$B_X(4) = \Big\{\Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_4^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big),\ \Big(\omega_{I_3^l}^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_4^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big)\Big\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
B_X(I_4) \setminus B_X\Big(\mathcal{L}^{I_4}_{G_4(\varnothing)}\Big) = \Big\{&\Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_4^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), \Big(\omega_\varnothing^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_{\text{dep}}^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), \\
&\Big(\omega_{I_3^l}^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_4^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big), \Big(\omega_{I_4^l}^{I_3^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^l}, \omega_\varnothing^{I_4^r}, \omega_{\text{dep}}^{I_4}, \omega_{\text{ind}}^{I_3}\Big)\Big\}. \qquad \diamondsuit
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(s)}$ denote the waiting time for the event $B_X(s)$, $s \in \Gamma$ (condition (21) is then obviously satisfied). By construction, $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(J)}$ are geometrically distributed with parameters r_α and r_J, $\alpha \in G$, $J \in \mathcal{S}$. Since for every $\alpha \in G, H \subseteq E$, the family $\big(X_t^J\big)_{J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}}$ is independent, the family of waiting times $\big(\mathcal{T}_{B_X(J)}\big)_{J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}}$ is independent as well, and, as a minimum of independent geometric variables, $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}$ is geometrically distributed

with parameter $1-\lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}$. For any $H \subseteq E$, the waiting time $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}$ is geometric with parameter $r_{I_\alpha} - (1-\lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}) = \lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)} - \lambda^{I_\alpha}_{\varnothing}$ (recall that $B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}) \subseteq B_X(I_\alpha)$ by Fact (A)). Since the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied, we can conclude directly:

Corollary 1. *Let $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ be a fragmentation tree. Then*

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}(\varnothing) \cap m_{B_X}(\varnothing)\big) = \sum_{H\subseteq E} (-1)^{|H|}\, \mathbf{P}\big(\,\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_X}(H) \cap m_{B_X}(H)\big),$$

with m_{B_X}, $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_X}$ and $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}$ as in (22)–(24), and B replaced by B_X.

3.3.2 Constructing the fragmentation process from the auxiliary process.

We now present a pathwise construction for realisations of $(\widehat{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ that have the correct law as long as they are compatible with a given fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$. We say that $\widehat{F}_t$ is *compatible* with T^L if $\widehat{F}_t \in \mathcal{R}(T^L)$. In this case, $(\widehat{F}_{t'})_{0\leqslant t'\leqslant t}$ matches a stump tree of T^L. We use the auxiliary process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ for the construction.

Recall that the transition from $\widehat{F}_{t-1}$ to $\widehat{F}_t$ is determined by the family of independent random variables $(A^J_t)_{J\in\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{F}_{t-1}}}$ (see Definition 1). Now fix a tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ and construct the enlarged family $\big(A^J_t\big)_{J\in\mathcal{S}}$ from X_t by prescribing that, for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} A^J_t = \varnothing, \text{ if and only if } X^J_t = \omega^J_\varnothing, \text{ for all } J \in \mathcal{S},\\ A^{I_\alpha}_t = \{\alpha\}, \text{ if and only if } X^{I_\alpha}_t = \omega^{I_\alpha}_\alpha, \text{ for all } \alpha \in G. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

This entails that $A^J_t = \varnothing$ with probability $1 - r_J$ for all $J \in \mathcal{S}$, and $A^{I_\alpha}_t = \{\alpha\}$ with probability r_α, $\alpha \in G$. On the other hand, it implies that

$$A^J_t \in J, \text{ if and only if } X^J_t = \omega^J_J, \text{ for } J \in \mathcal{L}_G, \tag{41}$$

which happens with probability r_J, and

$$A^{I_\alpha}_t \in I_\alpha \setminus \alpha, \text{ if and only if } X^{I_\alpha}_t \in \omega^{I_\alpha}_{I_\alpha} \setminus \omega^{I_\alpha}_\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha \in G, \tag{42}$$

which is the case with probability $r_{I_\alpha\setminus\alpha}$. If we want to know the precise event in these cases, we can use additional randomness to decide for $A^J_t = \{\beta\}$ with probability r_β for all $\beta \in J \in \mathcal{L}_G$, and $A^{I_\alpha}_t = \{\beta\}$, $\beta \in I_\alpha \setminus \alpha$, for all $\alpha \in G$, but this is never required in our construction; what matters is that, under the construction in (40), each A^J_t has the right probabilities for the *compatible events* (those in (40)) and their complements, for every given t and every given $J \in \mathcal{S}$. Also, the A^J_t inherit from the X^J_t the i.i.d. property over t and the independence across disjoint fragments.

We now proceed as follows. Start with $\widehat{F}_0 = \varnothing$, which is certainly compatible with the given T^L. If $\widehat{F}_{t-1}$ is compatible, then construct $\widehat{F}_t$ from $\widehat{F}_{t-1}$ according to Definition 1, but use the $\big(A^J_t\big)_{J\in\mathcal{S}}$ from (40)–(42). If only *compatible events* occur for all $J \in \mathcal{L}_{\widehat{F}_{t-1}}$, then

$\widehat{F}_t$ is compatible as well. If at least one *incompatible* event occurs (at least one event of those in (41) or (42)), then $\widehat{F}_t$ is incompatible. We say the construction *fails* at time t and discontinue it. Since the subfamily $(A_t^J)_{J\in\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{F}_{t-1}}}$ has the right law for the compatible events, we know that $(\widehat{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ has the right law for all $t < t_f$, where t_f is the failure time.

Proposition 2. *For every given fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ and the pathwise construction of $\widehat{F}$ described above, we have*

$$\widehat{\mathrm{MAX}}_{t,\,B_F}(\varnothing) \cap \widehat{m}_{B_F}(\varnothing) = \mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}(\varnothing) \cap m_{B_X}(\varnothing), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}_0 \tag{43}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\widehat{\mathrm{MAX}}_{t,\,B_F}(\varnothing) \cap \widehat{m}_{B_F}(\varnothing)\Big) = \mathbf{P}\Big(\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}(\varnothing) \cap m_{B_X}(\varnothing)\Big), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{44}$$

where $\widehat{\mathrm{MAX}}_{t,\,B_F}$ and $\widehat{m}_{B_F}$ are the discrete-time versions of (22) *and* (23) *with B replaced by B_F.*

The description in terms of the waiting times of the auxiliary process offers a great advantage since this law is known and does not change over time.

Proof. We start by considering the events $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(\varnothing)$ and $m_B(\varnothing)$ for general B. We know by definition that $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(\varnothing) \subseteq \{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} < \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_G)} \text{ for all } \alpha \in G\}$. Since by Fact 3 (C) furthermore $\mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}_G)} \leqslant \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(\varnothing)})}$ for all $\alpha \in G$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(\varnothing) \cap \Big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B(I_\alpha)\setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(\varnothing)})}\Big\} \\
&= \mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(\varnothing) \cap \Big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} = \min\Big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(I_\alpha)\setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(\varnothing)})}, \mathcal{T}_{B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(\varnothing)})}\Big\}\Big\} \\
&= \mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(\varnothing) \cap \Big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B(I_\alpha)}\Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

for every $\alpha \in G$. We can therefore rewrite

$$\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(\varnothing) \cap m_B(\varnothing) = \mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B}(\varnothing) \cap \bigcap_{\alpha\in G} \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B(I_\alpha)}\big\}. \tag{45}$$

The choice $B = B_F$ or $B = B_X$ in (45) turns the claim (43) into

$$\widehat{\mathrm{MAX}}_{t,\,B_F}(\varnothing) \cap \bigcap_{\alpha\in G} \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{B_F(\alpha)} = \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{B_F(I_\alpha)}\big\} = \mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}(\varnothing) \cap \bigcap_{\alpha\in G} \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)}\big\}. \tag{46}$$

Recall that $B_F(s) = \{s\}$ for all $s \in \Gamma$, such that $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{B_F(s)} = \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_s = \min\big\{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha : \alpha \in s\big\}$ is the time at which the first link in s is removed. Now, assume that we have shown the identification

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_J = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(J)} \text{ for all } J \in \mathcal{S} \text{ given } \bigcap_{\alpha\in G} \{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\alpha}\}. \tag{47}$$

Due to (40)–(42), it then follows under the pathwise construction of $\widehat{F}$ from the auxiliary process that $\{\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = \widehat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\alpha}\} = \{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)}\}$. Together with (47), this implies $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}_\alpha = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha \in G$. Equation (47) therefore entails (46), so it suffices to show (47).

We first show the relation (47) for all internal fragments (i.e. for all I_α, $\alpha \in G$). Start with the set of links $I_\gamma = L$ and initial value $\widehat{F}_0^L = \{\varnothing\}$. For $t \geqslant 1$, the first event $\{\widehat{F}_t^L \neq \varnothing\}$ happens when $\{A_t^L \in L\}$ for the first time; this happens at $t = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_L$. Under (40), $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_L$ corresponds to the first time at which $\{X_t^L \in \omega_L^L\}$ (at time $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(L)}$); this gives $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_L = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(L)}$.

Now consider a link $\beta \in G \setminus \{\gamma\}$, and assume that we have already identified $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\nu)}$ for the parent node ν of β. Given $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\nu = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu}$, we conclude $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu} < \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\beta}$ since $\nu \notin I_\beta \subset I_\nu$. This yields $\widehat{F}^{I_\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu}} = \varnothing$ by (15). Now consider the first time $t' > \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu}$ the event $\{\widehat{F}^{I_\beta}_{t'} \neq \varnothing\}$ occurs. Again by (15), this time is $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\beta}$. Due to (40), the event $\{\widehat{F}^{I_\beta}_{t'} \neq \varnothing\}$ with $t' > \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu}$ happens when $\{X^{I_\beta}_{t'} \in \omega^{I_\beta}_{I_\beta}\}$ for the first time, which is at time $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\beta)}$. Since we assumed that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\nu)}$ and since $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\nu)} \leqslant \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\beta)}$ due to (20), we conclude $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\beta)} > \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\nu}$, which gives $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\beta)} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\beta}$.

It remains to show the equality of the waiting times for the full external fragments $J \in \mathcal{L}_G$. For each such fragment J, denote by $\delta := \delta_J \in G$ the unique link for which $J \in \{I_\delta^l, I_\delta^r\}$. Assume that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_\delta = \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\delta}$ and one has already identified $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{I_\delta} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\delta)}$. With the same arguments as above, we conclude that under the given assumption $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_J = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(J)}$.

To finally show (44) recall that, for a given fragmentation tree T^L, $(\widehat{F}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ has the right law for all $t < t_f$, where t_f is the first time at which $\widehat{F}_{t_f}$ fails to be compatible with the tree. Since $\widehat{\mathrm{MAX}}_{t,B_F}(\varnothing) \cap \widehat{m}_{B_F}(\varnothing)$ describes a sequence of events that are all compatible with T^L, (44) follows. □

Before we give an explicit expression for the tree probabilities in discrete time, let us comment on the meaning of the joint event $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,B_X}(\varnothing) \cap m_{B_X}(\varnothing)$ for the auxiliary process and compare it with the corresponding joint event in the fragmentation process. We start with the ancestral relation and compare the event $B(I_\alpha) \setminus B(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})$ for the choices $B = B_F$ and $B = B_X$ for general $H \subseteq E$ and $\alpha \in G$. Recall that, for the fragmentation process, we set $B_F(s) = \{s\}$ and obtained in (31) that $B_F(I_\alpha) \setminus B_F(\mathcal{L}_{G_\alpha(H)}) = G_\alpha(H)$. For the auxiliary process the events are more subtle. We find

$$B_X(I_\alpha) \setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}) = \big\{\omega \in \Omega : \pi_{I_\alpha}(\omega) \in \omega^{I_\alpha}_{I_\alpha} \text{ and } \pi_J(\omega) = \omega^J_\varnothing \text{ for all } J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\big\} \quad (48)$$

$$= \bigcup_{\beta\in G_\alpha(H)} \Big\{\omega \in \Omega : \pi_{I_\beta}(\omega) \in \{\omega^{I_\beta}_\beta, \omega^{I_\beta}_{\mathrm{dep}}\} \text{ and } \pi_J(\omega) = \omega^J_\varnothing \text{ for all } J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}\Big\}$$

$$= \bigcup_{\beta\in G_\alpha(H)} \Big\{\omega \in \Omega : \pi_{I_\beta}(\omega) \in \{\omega^{I_\beta}_\beta, \omega^{I_\beta}_{\mathrm{dep}}\} \text{ and } \pi_J(\omega) = \omega^J_\varnothing \text{ for all } J \in \mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)} \setminus \mathcal{L}^{I_\beta}_{G_\beta(H)}\Big\}, \quad (49)$$

see also Example 1. The first equality is a reformulation of $B_X(I_\alpha) \setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})$ in terms of the explicit events $B_X(I_\alpha) \setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})$ is composed of. The second equality follows inductively: $\pi_{I_\alpha}(\omega) \in \omega^{I_\alpha}_{I_\alpha}$ is equivalent to either $\pi_{I_\alpha}(\omega) \in \{\omega^{I_\alpha}_\alpha, \omega^{I_\alpha}_{\mathrm{dep}}\}$, or $\pi_{I_\alpha}(\omega) = \omega^{I_\alpha}_{\mathrm{ind}}$. In the first case, this implies $\pi_I(\omega) = \omega^I_\varnothing$ for all $I \in \mathcal{S}^{I_\alpha} \setminus \{I_\alpha\}$ by (38). In the second case, there

exists (at least) one fragment $K \in \{I_\alpha^l, I_\alpha^r\}$ such that $\pi_K(\omega) = \omega_K^K$. Climbing up the tree in a bottom-up manner yields the expression. The third equality follows again from the fact that $\pi_{I_\beta}(\omega) \in \{\omega_\beta^{I_\beta}, \omega_{\mathrm{dep}}^{I_\beta}\}$ implies $\pi_J(\omega) = \omega_\varnothing^J$ for all $J \in \mathcal{L}_{G_\beta(H)}^{I_\beta}$ by (38). It is interesting to note here that the formulation in (49) requires information about the complete partial order within the component $T_\alpha(H)$, whereas in (48), it suffices to know the vertex set $G_\alpha(H)$ of the subtree (analogous to the situation in the fragmentation process).

Considering now the ancestor relation $m_{B_X}(H)$, we see from (49) that, for a given $\alpha \in G$, $B_X(\alpha)$ not only competes with all $B_X(\beta)$, $\beta \in G_\alpha(H)$, but also with the corresponding dependent events — but the result only counts when 'nothing happens' in the disjoint fragments in the *same* subtree ($\pi_J = \omega_\varnothing^J$ for all $J \in \mathcal{L}_{G_\alpha(H)}^{I_\alpha} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{G_\beta(H)}^{I_\beta}$). These conditions are far more intricate compared to $m_{B_F}(H)$, where α simply needs to be the first link that is removed in the vertex set $G_\alpha(H)$ of $T_\alpha(H)$.

In analogy with $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_F}(\varnothing)$, $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}(\varnothing)$ is the event that all $B_X(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in G$, appear before t and none of the $B_X(J)$, where the $J \in \mathcal{L}_G$ are the external fragments. This means in particular that 'dependent' events in the internal fragments are allowed to show up before t, provided nothing happens in the external fragments. Altogether, the joint event $\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}(\varnothing) \cap m_{B_X}(\varnothing)$ therefore says that every $B_X(\alpha)$ needs to appear before the corresponding dependent event (provided nothing happens to the disjoint fragments in the same subtree) and before t, but once $B_X(\alpha)$ appeared, neither this nor the corresponding dependent part has an effect.

3.4 Tree probabilities in discrete time

We can now harvest the consequences and state an explicit expression for tree probabilities in discrete time. Denote by $\{\widehat{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\}$ the discrete-time version of (19).

Proposition 3. *For a given fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, L)$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, one has $\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big) = (1 - r_L)^t = \big(\lambda_\varnothing^L\big)^t$ for $G = \varnothing$, and, for $G \neq \varnothing$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big) = \sum_{H \subseteq E} (-1)^{|H|} \left[\big(\lambda_{G_\gamma(H)}^L\big)^t - \big(\lambda_\varnothing^L\big)^t\right] \prod_{\alpha \in G} \frac{r_\alpha}{\lambda_{G_\alpha(H)}^{I_\alpha} - \lambda_\varnothing^{I_\alpha}},$$

where the λ's are defined as in (35).

Proof. We first employ Proposition 2 together with Corollary 1 to rewrite the matching probability corresponding to the fragmentation process in terms of the auxiliary process:

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big) = \mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MAX}_{t,\,B_X}(\varnothing) \cap m_{B_X}(\varnothing)\big) = \sum_{H \subseteq E} (-1)^{|H|}\, \mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_X}(H) \cap m_{B_X}(H)\big). \tag{50}$$

Now fix a set of edges $H \subseteq E$ and consider the event $\mathrm{MIN}_{t,\,B_X}(H)$ on the right-hand side of (50). In contrast to the continuous-time case, the family $\big(\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)}\big)_{\alpha \in G_\gamma(H)}$ is not independent, so $\min\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} : \alpha \in G_\gamma(H)\}$ is not a simple geometric waiting time. But, taking the intersection with $m_{B_X}(H)$, we can use that $\min\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} : \alpha \in G_\gamma(H)\} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\gamma)}$

by Fact 3 (B) and, again intersecting with $m_{B_X}(H)$, that $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\gamma)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}$ since $I_\gamma = L = \mathcal{L}_\varnothing$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B_X}(H) \cap m_{B_X}(H) &= \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\} \cap m_{B_X}(H)\\ &= \big\{\min\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}, \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\}\\ &\qquad \cap\, m_{B_X}(H)\\ &= \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\} \cap m_{B_X}(H).\end{aligned}$$

Let us now investigate the connection between $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\}$ and $m_{B_X}(H)$. To this end, consider first an $\alpha \notin G_\gamma(H)$. For this we know that there is a $J \in \mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)}$ such that $I_\alpha \subseteq J$; thus $B_X(\alpha) \subseteq B_X(I_\alpha) \setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}) \subseteq B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)}) \subseteq B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)$ by (20). Since the minimum of a collection of events is independent of the order in which (some of) the events occur, we obtain the independence of $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\}$ and $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}\big\}$ for every $\alpha \notin G_\gamma(H)$. Consider now $\alpha \in G_\gamma(H)$. We can then obviously decompose the event $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})}\big\}$ into

$$\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)} \leqslant t\big\} \cap \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}^L_{G_\gamma(H)}\setminus\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})} > t\big\} \cap \big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})} > t\big\}.$$

Due to the independence of the X^J_t's for disjoint sets J, we conclude that the event $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}\big\}$ is independent of $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)}\setminus\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})} > t\big\}$. The independence of $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}\big\}$ and $\big\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})} > t\big\}$ is obvious since the respective events $B_X(I_\alpha) \setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})$ and $B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})$ are disjoint; the independence of $\{\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)} \leqslant t\}$ follows again by the argument that the minimum of a collection of events is independent of the order in which (some of) the events occur. Altogether, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B_X}(H) \cap m_{B_X}(H)\big) = \big[\mathbf{P}\big(\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)})} > t\big) - \mathbf{P}\big(\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)} > t\big)\big] \times \mathbf{P}\big(m_{B_X}(H)\big),$$

where we used that $B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\gamma(H)}) \subseteq B_X(\mathcal{L}_\varnothing)$ by Fact 3 (A). Since for $\alpha, \beta \in G$ with $\alpha \prec \beta$, $B_X(\alpha) \notin B_X(I_\beta)$ and hence $B_X(\alpha) \notin B_X(I_\beta) \setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}_{G_\alpha(H)})$, we can furthermore decompose the probability for $m_{B_X}(H)$ into independent factors:

$$\mathbf{P}\big(m_{B_X}(H)\big) = \prod_{\alpha\in G} \mathbf{P}\big(\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\alpha)} = \mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}\big).$$

Now recall that each $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}$ is geometric with parameter $1 - \lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}$ and that each $\mathcal{T}_{B_X(I_\alpha)\setminus B_X(\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)})}$ is geometric with parameter $\lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)} - \lambda^{I_\alpha}_{\varnothing}$. All in all, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\big(\mathrm{MIN}_{t,B_X}(H) \cap m_{B_X}(H)\big) &= \Big[\big(1 - \big(1 - \lambda^L_{G_\gamma(H)}\big)\big)^t - \big(1 - \big(1 - \lambda^L_{\varnothing}\big)\big)^t\Big] \prod_{\alpha\in G} \frac{r_\alpha}{\lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)} - \lambda^{I_\alpha}_{\varnothing}}\\ &= \Big[\big(\lambda^L_{G_\gamma(H)}\big)^t - \big(\lambda^L_{\varnothing}\big)^t\Big] \prod_{\alpha\in G} \frac{r_\alpha}{\lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)} - \lambda^{I_\alpha}_{\varnothing}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Equation (50) then completes the proof. □

Remark 7. For better comparison of the probability of a fragmentation tree in continuous time (Proposition 1) and discrete time (Proposition 3), we can use the reformulation

$$\lambda^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)} - \lambda^{I_\alpha}_{\varnothing} = \prod_{J\in\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}} (1-r_J) - \Big(1-\sum_{\nu\in I_\alpha} r_\nu\Big) = \sum_{\nu\in G_\alpha(H)} r_\nu + \sum_{\substack{J\subseteq\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)},\\ |J|>1}} (-1)^{|J|}\prod_{I\in J} r_I. \ \diamondsuit$$

Corollary 2. *For every $G \subseteq L$, the probability of the discrete-time fragmentation process to be in state G at time $t \geqslant 0$ is given by*

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t = G\big) = \sum_{T^L\in\tau(G,L)} \mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big), \tag{51}$$

with $\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t \leftrightarrow T^L\big)$ as in Proposition 3 and $\tau(G,L)$ the set of all fragmentation trees with vertex set G and underlying link set L.

Again, in contrast to the continuous-time case, there is (in general) no simple explicit expression for the sum in (51). But Remark 7 shows that there is one exception, namely the case $|\mathcal{L}^{I_\alpha}_{G_\alpha(H)}| \leqslant 1$ for every $\alpha \in G$ and every $H \subseteq E$. If $L = \{1,\dots,n\}$, this is true for $G \subseteq \{1,n\}$, in which case

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\widehat{F}_t = G\big) = \sum_{\varnothing\neq H\subseteq G} (-1)^{|H|}\,\big[\big(\lambda^L_H\big)^t - \big(\lambda^L_\varnothing\big)^t\big].$$

This goes together with observations in [17], where a subset of links that only contains the 'ends' of L induced significant simplifications. This now becomes clear in the light of our event structure: $\alpha \in \{1,n\}$ implies that either $I^l_\alpha = \varnothing$ or $I^r_\alpha = \varnothing$, so that the probability for $\omega^{I_\alpha}_{\mathrm{dep}}$ vanishes, cf. (37).

3.5 Afterthoughts

The aim of this article was to give a conceptual proof for the distribution of F_t and to identify the underlying principle of inclusion-exclusion. It turned out to be useful to collect all realisations of $(F_{t'})_{0\leqslant t'\leqslant t}$ whose partial order on the waiting times agrees with the partial order on the set of vertices of a rooted fragmentation tree $T^L = (\gamma, G, E, \mathcal{S})$. The event $\{F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\}$ that $(F_{t'})_{0\leqslant t'\leqslant t}$ matches a T^L can be expressed as the joint event of maxima of waiting times $(\{\max\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in G\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{L\setminus G}\})$ together with the ordering relation $m_{B_F}(\varnothing) = \{\mathcal{T}_\alpha = \mathcal{T}_{G_\alpha(\varnothing)}\ \forall\ \alpha \in G\}$, c.f. (19). Inspired by the fact that the minimum of a collection of independent waiting times is independent of the order in which (some of) its events occur, whereas the respective maximum is not, we aimed at an expression of $\{F_t \leftrightarrow T^L\}$ in terms of minima. The well-known Möbius inversion of the subset poset $(\mathcal{P}(L), \subseteq)$ [1, Ex. 4.19] yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(F_t \leftrightarrow T^L) &= \mathbf{P}\big(\big\{\max\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in G\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{L\setminus G}\big\} \cap m_{B_F}(\varnothing)\big)\\ &= \sum_{\varnothing\neq N\subseteq G} (-1)^{|G|-|N|}\ \mathbf{P}\big(\big\{\min\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in N\} \leqslant t,\, t < \mathcal{T}_{L\setminus N}\big\} \cap m_{B_F}(\varnothing)\big). \end{aligned}\tag{52}$$



Figure 8: Left: Simplified representation of a recombination event in which maternal and paternal gene sequences cross over and physically swap their genetic material to form a mixed-type offspring. Right: Ancestry of a single individual backward in time. The genetic material of the individual is dispersed across the two parents. Restriction to single crossovers ensures that the sequence splits into two contiguous blocks. Horizontal lines indicate nonancestral material, i.e. genetic material that is not passed on to the offspring and thus irrelevant for it.

Since the inequalities in (52), except for $|N| = 1$, do not contain any information about the ordering of the events, $m_{B_F}(\varnothing)$ can not be separated into an ordering of events corresponding to N and an ordering of events corresponding to $L \setminus N$. Except for $N = G$, therefore, $m_{B_F}(\varnothing)$ is not independent of the inequalities in (52). One could now iteratively express the minima in (52) for all $\varnothing \neq N \subset G$ as sums of maxima, cancel terms (only summands with $\max\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha \in R\}$, where R is a stump set of T, will survive), separate the order relation as in the proof of Lemma 1, and rewrite the resulting maxima again as a sum of minima via Möbius inversion on the subset poset. One proceeds until there are only summands left in which the ordering of the events is independent of the inequalities for the minima.

In every step of this iterative procedure, the ordering relation within a current stump tree $T_\gamma(H)$ is separated into an ordering within a stump tree of $T_\gamma(H)$ and the ordering in the remaining part. This may be described by successive edge deletion within the stump tree of a rooted forest and thus justifies our construction of the pruning poset. Möbius inversion on the pruning poset therefore solves the iteration described above (Theorem 2) and is thus the key to an explicit expression for the tree probabilities in the context of the fragmentation process $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$. Due to the general structure of the pruning poset, the method might generalise to other Markov chains for which sets of realisations can be represented by rooted trees.

4 Biological application

As mentioned earlier, the fragmentation process $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ comes from the context of population genetics. It emerges when the ancestry of individuals in a very large population that has evolved under single-crossover recombination is traced back into the past, see [3] for discrete time and [7] for continuous time. *Recombination* occurs during sexual reproduction and refers to the reshuffling of the genetic material of two parents into an offspring individual of 'mixed' type (see Fig. 8, left). Single-crossover recombination means that at most one *crossover* of the parental gene sequences occurs during a given reproduction event; this is indeed a biologically relevant case even for fairly large genomic regions [9].

More precisely, let a chromosome (or gene sequence) be described by $l+1$ discrete positions

that are called *sites* and that are captured in the set of half-integers $\{\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{2n+1}{2}\}$. A crossover may happen between any two neighbouring sites. As illustrated in Figure 8, from the backward perspective, a recombination event causes a split of the genetic material into two parts, one part inherited from the mother, one from the father. If we restrict ourselves to single crossovers, each event leads to a splitting into two contiguous fragments of sites, the leading and the trailing one. If population size is very large (idealised as infinite), these parts will (with probability one) never merge again, i.e. will never find a common ancestor from which they both descend, see [7, Prop. 1] in continuous time and [3, Prop. 2] in discrete time. Thus, when starting with a single individual in a sufficiently large population, its genetic material is dispersed across an increasing number of ancestors.

Now assume that neighbouring sites are connected by the links $L = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, on which our fragmentation process was defined. More precisely, assume that every link $\alpha \in L$ connects the two sites $\frac{2\alpha-1}{2}$ and $\frac{2\alpha+1}{2}$. Then, every splitting event of a set of sites into two contiguous blocks can be described by the removal of the link that connects the two blocks. The successive dispersal of the genetic material of a single individual under single-crossover recombination may thus be described by the successive removal of links, i.e. by the fragmentation process $(F_t)_{t\geqslant 0}$ with state space $\mathcal{P}(L)$ and initial state $F_t = \varnothing$. The more links removed, the more ancestors into which the genetic material of the individual is partitioned. This way, the fragmentation process corresponds to the so-called *ancestral recombination trees* of population genetics [3].

Apart from being interesting in its own right, the distribution of the partitioning process is also an essential building block to the solution of the *deterministic recombination equation*, a discrete- or continuous-time dynamical system that describes the dynamics of the type composition of a population under recombination forward in time. For more on this, see [2].

Let us finally note that the time course of the distribution of Markov chains also plays an important role in computational biology, as, for example, in sequence alignment [13]. Here, a massive computational simplification is achieved by integrating out the event times while keeping the time order of events. In the fragmentation process, we build on the same idea, but the tree structure allows to go one step further and integrate out all times that belong to the same *partial* order of events.

Acknowledgements

It is our pleasure to thank Michael Baake for valuable discussions and Fernando Cordero for his help to improve the manuscript. The authors gratefully acknowledge the support from the Priority Programme *Probabilistic Structures in Evolution (SPP 1590)*, which is funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation, DFG).

References

[1] M. Aigner. *Combinatorial Theory.* Springer, Berlin, 1979.

[2] E. Baake and M. Baake. Haldane linearisation done right: Solving the nonlinear recombination equation the easy way. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 36: 6645–6656, 2016.

[3] E. Baake and U. von Wangenheim. Single-crossover recombination and ancestral recombination trees. *J. Math. Biol.*, 68: 1371–1402, 2014.

[4] P. Clifford and A. Sudbury. A sample path proof of the duality for stochastically monotone Markov processes. *Ann. Prob.*, 13: 558–565, 1985.

[5] M. Drmota. *Random Trees: An Interplay between Combinatorics and Probability.* Springer, Wien, 2009.

[6] M. Drmota, A. Iksanov, M. Möhle, and U. Rösler. A limiting distribution for the number of cuts needed to isolate the root of a random recursive tree. *Random Struc. Algor.*, 34: 319–336, 2009.

[7] M. Esser, S. Probst, and E. Baake. Partitioning, duality, and linkage disequilibria in the Moran model with recombination. *J. Math. Biol.*, 73: 161–197, 2016.

[8] L. Foissy. The infinitesimal Hopf algebra and the poset of planar forests. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 30: 277–309, 2009.

[9] K.J. Hillers. Crossover interference. *Curr. Biol.*, 14: R1036–R1037, 2004.

[10] S. Janson. Random cutting and records in deterministic and random trees. *Random Struct. Alg.*, 29: 139–179, 2006.

[11] J.I. Ljubič. *Mathematical Structures in Population Genetics.* Biomathematics, 22. Springer, Berlin, 1992.

[12] A Meir and J.W. Moon. Cutting down random trees. *J. Austral. Math. Soc.*, 11: 313–324, 1970.

[13] I. Miklós, G.A. Lunter, and I. Holmes. A "long indel" model for evolutionary sequence alignment. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 21: 529, 2004.

[14] A. Panholzer. Cutting down very simple trees. *Quaest. Math.*, 29: 211–227, 2006.

[15] G.-C. Rota. On the foundations of combinatorial theory I. Theory of Möbius functions. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie*, 2: 340–368, 1964.

[16] R.P. Stanley. *Enumerative Combinatorics*, Vol I. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Reprint 2002.

[17] U. von Wangenheim, E. Baake, and M. Baake. Single-crossover recombination in discrete time. *J. Math. Biol.*, 60: 727–760, 2010.